



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,438	07/02/2003	Teck H. Hu	2100.000800	6519
46290	7590	04/16/2008	EXAMINER	
WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON 10333 RICHMOND, SUITE 1100 HOUSTON, TX 77042				HEIBER, SHANTELL LAKETA
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2617				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/16/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/612,438	HU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	SHANTELL HEIBER	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2008.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 7/2/03 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments, see applicant's remarks, filed on January 7, 2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-29 under 35 U.S.C 102 (b) as being anticipated by Tiedemann et al. have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Hill et al. (Hill), U.S. Patent No. 6,775,256.
2. Hill discloses a packet scheduler for Code Division Multiple Access cellular mobile communication system for scheduling transmissions of packets in order to maximize the capacity of the system. A candidate set of packets are selected and continues through an iteration process for determining a final candidate set based on calculated transmit power requirements. See Abstract, Col. 5, lines 43-47 and Col. 6, lines 10-41. Hill fails to specifically mention channelization codes throughout the body of the detailed description of inventor's preferred embodiment (Cols. 3-7), however, Hill does disclose in detail CDMA communication systems. According to Col. 1, line 57-Col. 2, line 15 and Col. 2, lines 34-54, in a CDMA system, codes are allocated to remote terminals to minimize the interference caused between remote terminals. Hill further mentions the importance for optimal utilization of resources to schedule the order and time for transmission of the individual packets. Most packet based systems contain schedulers which control when the individual data packets are transmitted and therefore share the available resource (for example, power and codes in a CDMA system). Hill' s

invention covers the need for a scheduler to optimize for CDMA systems where codes and power must be shared.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-4, 611, 14, 16-17, 21-24, 26, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hill et al. (Hill), U.S. Patent No. 6,775,256.

**Regarding Claims 1, 10, 16 and 28, Hill discloses** a method of communication, comprising: assigning at least one channelization code to each of a plurality of data packets available for a current transmission; and allocating available transmission power to the channelization codes based on a plurality of channel quality metrics, at least a subset of the channelization codes being assigned respective portions of the available power, wherein: the assigning and allocating further comprise evaluating a number representing how many channelization codes are to be assigned to each of the packets and evaluating the portion of the allocated transmission power to be assigned to each data packet using an iterative procedure that adjusts the values for the portions of the allocated transmission power and the number of channelization codes for at least one iteration responsive to the channel quality metrics and the values for the portions of the allocated transmission power and the number of channelization codes

determined during at least one prior iteration to optimize a capacity of a channel for communicating the data packets during the current transmission. (**The scheduler 231 selects a candidate set of packets. The transmit powers required to transmit the packets is calculated based on the packets in the candidate set. Based on the calculation of the transmit powers, the candidate set is modified. If it has not been determined that a final candidate set has been determined then a new calculation of transmit powers is performed based on the modified candidate set. This iteration continues until a final candidate set has been determined; Col. 4, lines 46-57; Col. 5, lines 43-47 and Col. 6, lines 1-55**)

**Regarding Claims 2, 17 and 18, Hill discloses** further comprising: determining the portions of the available power to be assigned based on the channel quality metrics and a first optimization parameter; determining the values of the number of channelization codes assigned to the data packets based on the determined portions of the available power and a second optimization parameter; and repeating over a plurality of iterations the determining of the portions of the available power and the determining of the values of the number of channelization codes. (**Col. 6, lines 1-26**)

**Regarding Claims 3 and 29, Hill discloses** further comprising: determining the number of channelization codes assigned to each data packet based on a size of the data packet and one of the channel quality estimates associated with the data packet; determining the portions of the available power to be assigned to each of the channelization codes based on a first optimization parameter; and repeating over a

plurality of iterations the determining of the number of channelization codes and the determining of the portions of the available power. (**Col. 6, lines 1-26**)

**Regarding Claims 4 and 19, Hill discloses** further comprising: terminating the repeating responsive to the assigned channelization codes in a first iteration being the same as the assigned channelization codes in a second later iteration; and truncating the subset of assigned channelization codes based on a maximum number of allowable channelization codes. (**Col. 6, lines 27-55**)

**Regarding Claims 6 and 21, Hill discloses** further comprising prioritizing the plurality of data packets. (**Col. 5, lines 1-16**)

**Regarding Claims 7 and 22, Hill discloses** wherein prioritizing the plurality of data packets further comprises: identifying a plurality of quality of service classes; assigning a predetermined amount of the available power to each of the quality of service classes; and assigning the channelization codes and the portions of the available power based on the predetermined amounts for each quality of service classes. (**The candidate set selection is based upon the size of queued packets, Quality of Service information and priority; Col. 5, lines 1-16**)

**Regarding Claims 8 and 23, Hill discloses** wherein prioritizing the plurality of data packets further comprises: identifying a plurality of quality of service classes; assigning the channelization codes and the portions of the available power for a first class of the quality of service classes; determining a remaining amount of the available power after the assigning for the first class; and assigning the channelization codes and the portions of the available power for a second class of the quality of service

classes based on the remaining amount of available power. (**A candidate set is continuously modified through iteration until a final candidate set is identified. During the modification, packets may be added and/or removed, therefore a new set is constantly being identified based on new calculations reflecting the modifications.** Also see rejection for Claims 7 and 22)

**Regarding Claims 9 and 24, Hill discloses** wherein prioritizing the plurality of data packets further comprises: identifying a plurality of quality of service classes; combining all data packets in the plurality of quality of service classes; sorting the combined users based on a fairness algorithm; and assigning the channelization codes and the portions of the available power based on the sorting. (**See rejections for Claims 7, 22, 8 and 23**)

**Regarding Claim 11, Hill discloses** further comprising initiating a communication link over a channel, the communication link being assigned to a quality of service class having a predetermined transmit power assignment and the power fraction is based on a portion of the predetermined transmit power. (**Col. 5, lines 1-16**)

**Regarding Claims 14 and 26, Hill discloses** wherein the first constraint and first optimization parameter are associated with the power available for communicating, and the channelization codes and power fractions associated with the signal are assigned by determining the portions of the available power to be assigned based on the first optimization parameter. (**Col. 6, lines 1-41**)

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 5, 12 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill in view of Gollamudi et al. (Gollamudi), U.S. Publication No. 2003/0123477.

4. **Regarding Claims 5, 12 and 20, Hill discloses** the method and system wherein the channelization codes and the power fractions associated with the signal are assigned based on the channel quality estimate to optimize a channel as described above.

5. Hill fails to disclose wherein optimizing the capacity further comprises optimizing a Shannon capacity of the channel for communicating the data packets.

6. In a similar field of endeavor, Gollamudi discloses an adaptive quality control loop for link rate adaptation in data packet communications. Gollamudi further discloses wherein optimizing the capacity further comprises optimizing a Shannon capacity of the channel for communicating the data packets. **[0003]-[0005]**

7. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to estimate channel conditions using a channel quality metric (Gollamudi) for maximizing the capacity of the system (Hill).

6. Claims 13, 15, 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill in view of Tiedemann, Jr. et al. (Tiedemann), U.S. Publication No. 2002/00304170..

**Regarding Claims 13, 15, 25 and 27, Hill discloses** the method and system wherein the channelization codes and power fractions associated with the signal are assigned by at least one of the channelization codes and the portions of power available for communicating based on the first optimization parameter as described above.

Hill fails to disclose further comprising: generating a cost function using a channel capacity equation having a first constraint, the cost function including a first optimization parameter associated with the first constraint; and determining a value for the first optimization parameter based on a first order derivative of the cost function.

In a similar field of endeavor, Tiedemann discloses a method and apparatus for maximizing the use of available capacity in a communication system. Tiedemann further discloses further comprising: generating a cost function using a channel capacity equation having a first constraint, the cost function including a first optimization parameter associated with the first constraint; and determining a value for the first optimization parameter based on a first order derivative of the cost function.

According to Tiedemann [0005]-[0007] cost is associated with each classification: CBR being the most expensive, VBR the next expensive and ABR the least expensive. Based on this priority list the portions of available power are assigned accordingly.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to determine the amount of power required for transmitting each code channel based upon priority so as to not exceed the total amount of power that the amplifier can provide without undesirable distortion [**Tiedemann-0007**].

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lundby et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,068,683 discloses a method and apparatus for high rate packet data and low delay data transmissions.

Hsu, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0090938 discloses a method of optimizing radiation pattern of smart antenna.

Ketchum, U.S. Patent No. 6,731,668 discloses a method and system for increased bandwidth efficiency multiple input-multiple output channels.

Bombay et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,999,517 discloses a method and apparatus for transmission of data on multiple propagation modes with far-end cross-talk cancellation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shantell Heiber whose telephone number is (571)272-0886. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00am-5:30pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. H./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2617  
April 2, 2008

/Lester Kincaid/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617